

United States District Court
District of South Carolina

Jackie Williams, # 231414;)	C/A No. 6:05-0915-GRA-WMC
)	
Petitioner;)	
)	Report and Recommendation
vs.)	
)	for Summary Dismissal
Mr. Collie Rushton, Warden of McCormick Corr. Inst.;)	
and Mr. Henry McMaster, Attorney General State of)	
South Carolina;)	
)	
R e s p o n d e n t s .)	
)	
)	

The Petitioner, Jackie Williams (hereafter, “the Petitioner”), is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* under Title 28 United States Code Section 2254. By definition, the relief which the Petitioner seeks must be based upon a finding that he is being illegally detained in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States. 28 U.S.C. §2241(b)(3). Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B), and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(c), D.S.C., the undersigned is authorized to review such petitions for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

BACKGROUND

The Petitioner is incarcerated at the McCormick Correctional Institution, McCormick, South Carolina, where he is serving a sentence of life imprisonment after he was convicted of murder in February, 1996, by a jury in the Court of General Sessions for Aiken County, South Carolina. The Petitioner sought and was denied relief in the state courts on his first application for Post-Conviction Relief (PCR) in October, 1998.

In April, 2000, he filed a petition for relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 in this

Court. See *Williams v. Catoe, et al.*, 6:00-0271 (D.S.C. 2000). On August 14, 2000, Summary judgment on the merits was granted with regard to his second and third grounds for relief: denial of due process and a claim of “actual innocence.” A conditional writ of *habeas corpus* was entered, however, with regard to his claim that he had been denied an appeal.

This Court may take judicial notice of this prior petition. *Colonial Penn Ins. Co. v. Coil*, 887 F.2d 1236, 1239 (4th Cir. 1989); *Shop v. Bell & Howell*, 872 F.2d 1178, 1182, 1989 (4th Cir. 1989); *Days v. Bounds*, 509 F. 2d 66 (4th Cir. 1975); *Mann v. Peoples First National Bank & Trust Co.*, 209 F.2d 570, 572 (4th Cir. 1954).

The State of South Carolina thereafter permitted the Petitioner to seek appellate review. Under South Carolina Appellate Court Rule (SCACR) 220(b) the conviction was affirmed. See *State v. Williams*, 2001-MO-072. The Petitioner filed a second PCR application, which was dismissed. His petitioner for Writ of Certiorari was denied by the South Carolina Supreme Court. See *Williams v. State*, 2002-CP-02-09029.

In his present action, the Petitioner renews his claims that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance in pre-trial investigation, preparation and conduct of his defense before the jury. The Petitioner also attacks the South Carolina PCR procedure as a denial of due process and equal protection of the laws. [1-1, p. 6.]

PRO SE PETITION

The Petitioner is a *pro se* litigant, and thus his pleadings are accorded liberal construction. *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5 (1980); *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Loe v. Armistead*, 582 F. 2d 1291 (4th Cir. 1978); *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F. 2d 1147 (4th 1978). *Pro se* pleadings are held to a less stringent

standard than those drafted by attorneys. Even under this less stringent standard, however, a *pro se* petition is still subject to summary dismissal. The mandated liberal construction means only that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so. *Barnett v. Hargett*, 174 F.3d 1128 (10th Cir. 1999). A court may not construct the plaintiff's legal arguments for him. *Small v. Endicott*, 998 F.2d 411 (7th Cir. 1993). Nor should a court "conjure up questions never squarely presented." *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985).

DISCUSSION

In order for this Court to entertain the current petition, the Petitioner must seek and obtain a Pre-Filing Authorization (PFA) from the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3). See *In re: Williams*, 364 F. 3d 235 (4th Cir. 2004), *cert. denied* — U.S. —, 125 S. Ct. 618 (2004); *In re: Williams*, 330 F. 3d 277 (4th Cir. 2003); *In re: Fowlkes*, 326 F. 3d 542 (4th Cir. 2003).

Accordingly, it is recommended that the above-captioned case be dismissed without prejudice and without requiring the respondents to file a return. See *Allen v. Perini*, 424 F.2d 134, 141 (6th Cir. 1970)(federal district courts have duty to screen habeas corpus petitions and eliminate burden placed on respondents caused by ordering an unnecessary answer or return). The Petitioner's attention is directed to the notice on the next page.

s/William M. Catoe
United States Magistrate Judge

March 29, 2005
Greenville, South Carolina

**Notice of Right to File Objections to Magistrate Judge's "Report and Recommendation"
& The Serious Consequences of a Failure to Do So**

The petitioner is hereby notified that any objections to the attached Report and Recommendation must be filed within **ten (10) days** of the date of its filing. 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Based thereon, this Report and Recommendation, any objections thereto, and the case file will be **delivered to a United States District Judge** fourteen (14) days after this Report and Recommendation is filed. A magistrate judge makes only a recommendation, and the authority to make a final determination in this case rests with the United States District Judge. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-271 (1976).

During the ten-day period, but not thereafter, a party must file with the Clerk of Court specific, written objections to the Report and Recommendation, if he or she wishes the United States District Judge to consider any objections. **Any written objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.** See *Keeler v. Pea*, 782 F. Supp. 42, 43-44 (D.S.C. 1992). Failure to file specific, written objections shall constitute a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the United States District Judge. See *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n. 4 (4th Cir.); and *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-847 & nn. 1-3 (4th Cir. 1985). Moreover, if a party files specific objections to a portion of a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, but does not file specific objections to other portions of the Report and Recommendation, that party waives appellate review of the portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which he or she did not object. In other words, a party's failure to object to one issue in a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation precludes that party from subsequently raising that issue on appeal, even if objections are filed on other issues. *Howard v. Secretary of HHS*, 932 F.2d 505, 508-509 (6th Cir. 1991). See also *Praylow v. Martin*, 761 F.2d 179, 180 n. 1 (4th Cir.) (party precluded from raising on appeal factual issue to which it did not object in the district court). In *Howard, supra*, the Court stated that general, non-specific objections are *not* sufficient:

A general objection to the entirety of the [magistrate judge's] report has the same effects as would a failure to object. The district court's attention is not focused on any specific issues for review, thereby making the initial reference to the [magistrate judge] useless. * * * This duplication of time and effort wastes judicial resources rather than saving them, and runs contrary to the purposes of the Magistrates Act. * * * We would hardly countenance an appellant's brief simply objecting to the district court's determination without explaining the source of the error.

Accord Lockert v. Faulkner, 843 F.2d 1015, 1017-1019 (7th Cir. 1988), where the Court held that the appellant, who proceeded *pro se* in the district court, was barred from raising issues on appeal that he did not specifically raise in his objections to the district court:

Just as a complaint stating only 'I complain' states no claim, an objection stating only 'I object' preserves no issue for review. * * * A district judge should not have to guess what arguments an objecting party depends on when reviewing a [magistrate judge's] report.

See also *Branch v. Martin*, 886 F.2d 1043, 1046 (8th Cir. 1989) ("no de novo review if objections are untimely or general"), which involved a *pro se* litigant; and *Goney v. Clark*, 749 F.2d 5, 7 n. 1 (3rd Cir. 1984) ("plaintiff's objections lacked the specificity to trigger *de novo* review").

This notice apprises the petitioner of the consequences of a failure to file specific, written objections. See *Wright v. Collins, supra*; and *Small v. Secretary of HHS*, 892 F.2d 15, 16 (2nd Cir. 1989). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections addressed as follows:

**Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 10768
Greenville, South Carolina 29603**